Mr. K. R. Viswambharan *(Ezhuvas-Talappalli)*: A most absurd proposal.

Deputy President: Your cut motion is out of order.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri)*: The Hon'ble Member Mr. Viswambharan must withdraw what he said. If he does not withdraw that word, I will give him a word in return.

Mr. K. R. Viswambharan *(Ezhuvas-Talappalli)*: I withdraw. *(Laughter)*.

CUT MOTION No. 4

Expansion of the Ministry

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi)*: Sir, I rise *to omit the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for Minister for Rural Development.* My motion runs as follows: "*What is required is not one Minister but a Council of Ministers, responsible to the legislature, with due safeguard for the protection of the minorities and for carrying out treaty obligations with the crown*".

Point of Order

Mr. T. P. Poulose *(Kanayannur)*: On a point of order. The subject of the cut motion is this. What is required is not one Minister, but a Council of Ministers responsible to the legislature, with due safeguards, etc. That has nothing to do with the policy of the Minister, or any of his actions. And the cut is to omit the whole salary. When there is a cut motion on the Minister's salary, the subject that can be discussed is the Minister's policy or his action.

Mr. C. V. Iyyu *(Kunnamkulam)*: He has nothing to say against the Minister. He is against the Ministry.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi)*: I don't want to give him any salary.

Mr. K. R. Viswambharan *(Ezhuvas-Talappalli)*: One thing has to be pointed out. With regard to the subject-matter of the discussion, there are many members of this party who are in agreement with the other members for the expansion of the ministry and for the expansion of the reforms. But we cannot vote for the omission of the whole allotment because we are in full agreement with the extension of the constitutional reforms. We cannot vote for the omission of the Rs. 6,000.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur)*: According to me, there is nothing wrong in the cut motion. There is only one issue, whether we have to scrap the present constitution, if there is not full responsible government.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi)*: My point is we do not want this Minister, this diarchy. If that Minister is gone, there will be no diarchy. If there is no salary, there will be no minister. Even in the year 1113, when His Highness the Maharaja allowed this reform, I was against this. But since His Highness the Maharaja was pleased to grant the reforms, I accepted the same. That is all. Even then I said that. The working of the diarchy system is hopeless.

Deputy President: The wording of the cut motion will not convey your intention. You want to have a number of ministers. Still there will be a reserved half.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi)*: My point is, I don't want one minister.

Deputy President: The cut motion as it is does not convey what you mean.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Trichur-North)*: Briefly it is stated. In his speech he will develop all the points. It is impossible to put all his points. He wants a number of ministers. He will develop his ideas, that Diwan is not necessary, the whole thing must be placed on a democratic basis—all this he will develop.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri)*: I am only saying that if discussion is prevented by raising points of order from the other side, before the subject is examined and placed before the House, then that will serve no purpose.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar *(Cheruthuruthi)*: The suggestion was only to make the point clear.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri)*: I will get many other chances to come again, if that is going to be the policy of the other side.

Mr. T. P. Poulose *(Kanayannur)*: It is not this side that gives the ruling. It is the Chair.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi)*: Apart from all these irrelevant matters, let us come to the point. There is one Minister. We don't want one Minister. I am making an alternate suggestion. It is very difficult to manage with one Minister. He is sitting there all alone. There is nobody to give him help. If he follows the advice of people sitting round him and behind him he is doomed. There is no non-official member there. If there is a Council of two or three Ministers, they can mutually discuss matters and come to a conclusion. Nobody under

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the Sun is perfect. A doctor may be perfect in medicines. Another man may be all right in educational matters. All these people sitting together—a council of ministers—can carry on the administration. A single Minister is a trouble. He is criticised by all. He has to persue official files but he has to keep secrecy; he cannot confide the secrets to the members. He has to drag on himself. According to the Cripp's proposals, British Government is going to give full independence to India after the war. Cochin also is a part of India. Therefore we are entitled to full responsible Government after the war. If the Hon'ble Secretary gives us an assurance that after the war the Government are prepared to grant full responsible Government, I shall withdraw. If he is not prepared, I will press this.

Mr. A. L. Antony *(Irinjalakkuda)*: May I know whether he wants the Pakistan system?

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi)*: There is no Pakistan here. Therefore, to put it in a nutshell, I want a council of ministers for administering the State. Due safeguards may be provided for the safety of the minorities, for fulfilling the obligations of the Maharaja towards the Crown, etc. The administration may be handed over to a Council of Ministers. We do not want a Diwan. If you ask me for details, I won't be able to say them here and now.

Mr. T. P. Poulose *(Kanayannur)*: Sir, I oppose this motion. At the same time I will make it clear that my opposition is not to the demand for full responsible government, but the issue raised in this cut motion, especially, as it has been explained, is not whether we should have full responsible government or not. The issue, as it stands, is whether we should refuse to work the present constitution if full responsible government is not immediately granted. To this suggestion that the Minister should refuse to function if immediately full responsible government is not granted, I cannot subscribe. Now, the result of passing this cut motion will be that the Minister will have to resign and refuse to work the constitution. Not only that, after the Minister resigns and refuses to work the constitution, no one else should take up the ministry as long as full responsible government is not granted. The passing of this cut motion will amount to a decision that the constitution should not be worked in this form. The issue before the House is not whether there should be a Minister who will work without salary or not. The issue before the House as explained in the cut motion is whether the constitution should in this form be worked or not. To this suggestion that the constitution should be entirely rejected at present, I cannot subscribe.

* മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. ആർ. വിശ്വംഭരൻ: സർ, പരിപൂർണ്ണമായ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തിനു ഈ നിയമസഭയിൽ ആരും എതിരല്ലെന്നു പല അവസരങ്ങളിലും ഇവിടെ വ്യക്തമാക്കീട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തിൽ ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ഗ്രാമോദ്ധാരണമന്ത്രിക്കു നിശ്ചയിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന ശമ്പളം ബഡ്ജറ്റിൽനിന്നു തിരെ ഒഴിവാക്കണമെന്നാണു് ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ചാലക്കുടി മെമ്പർ ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്നതു്. ഉള്ളിച്ച തലച്ചോറിൽനിന്നു് അതിന്റെ ചില പ്രവർത്തനങ്ങളാൽ വരുന്ന ഒരു ഉപക്ഷേപത്തേയും ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തിന്റെപേരിൽ താങ്ങുന്നതിനു് ഞങ്ങൾക്കു നിവൃത്തിയില്ലെന്നു് ഇവിടെ വ്യക്തമാക്കേണ്ടിയിരിക്കുന്നു. ഒരു ഉപക്ഷേപം ഇവിടെ കൊണ്ടുവരികയാണെങ്കിൽ അതിൽ അന്തർവിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന തത്വങ്ങളെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു്, അതിവിടെ കൊണ്ടുവരുന്ന മെമ്പർമാർ നല്ലപോലെ മനസ്സിലാക്കി ആ കാര്യത്തിന്റെ ശരിയായ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വം വഹിക്കണമെന്നാണു് എനിക്കവരോടു പറയുവാനുള്ളതു്. പരിണതപ്രജ്ഞനായ, ഈ നിയമസഭയുടെ ആരംഭകാലം മുതൽതന്നെ ഇവിടെ ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നവനും വന്നുപറയുന്ന ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മട്ടാഞ്ചേരി മെമ്പർ ഏതോ ചിലസംഗതികളെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു്, ചിലഹർജികൾ കൊടുക്കേണ്ടകാര്യങ്ങളെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു് വാദിക്കേണ്ടആവശ്യത്തിനു് മന്ത്രിയുടെ ശമ്പളത്തിൽ ഒരു ഉറപ്പിക വെട്ടിക്കുറക്കണമെന്നുള്ള ഒരു ഉപക്ഷേപം അയച്ചു്അതിന്റെ അനുവാദം നിഷേധിക്കപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കയാണു്. ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട മന്ത്രിയുടെ ശമ്പളം വകയിൽ ൩,൦൦൦ ഉറപ്പിക ഒഴിവാക്കിയാൽ ഇവിടെ മന്ത്രിയുടെ ഉദ്യോഗത്തിനു് ആളുണ്ടാകയില്ലെന്നും, ആ നിലയിൽ പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം ലഭിക്കുമെന്നുമാണു് ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ചാലക്കുടി മെമ്പർ പറയുന്നതു്. ഈവക നിരുത്തരവാദമായ വാദഗതികളെ അതേവിധത്തിൽ ഈ നിയമസഭക്കു സ്വീകരിക്കാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. ഈവക വാദഗതികളെ അടിസ്ഥാനപ്പെടുത്തി അവനവനു തോന്നുന്നവിധത്തിൽ നിരുത്തരവാദമായി കൊണ്ടുവരുന്ന ഇത്തരം ഉപക്ഷേപങ്ങൾ അവ അർഹിക്കുന്ന അവജ്ഞയോടുകൂടി തള്ളിക്കളയണമെന്നാണു് എനിക്കു പറയുവാനുള്ളതു്. പരിപൂർണ്ണമായ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം വേണമെന്നുള്ള കാര്യത്തിൽ ഈ നിയമസഭയിലെ എല്ലാ മെമ്പർമാർക്കും അനുകൂലമാണുള്ളതെന്നുള്ളതു് സംശയമില്ലാത്തതാണു്. ഇതു് ഇങ്ങിനെയുള്ള ഉപക്ഷേപംമൂലമല്ല ഇവിടെ കൊണ്ടുവരേണ്ടതു്. അതിനാൽ ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ സർവ്വശക്തികളും എടുത്തു് അതർഹി

*Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ക്കുന്ന വിധത്തിലുള്ള ഒരു സമീകരണം ഇതിനു നൽകണമെന്നു് ഈ നിയമസഭയുടെ പാരമ്പര്യത്തിന്റെപേരിലും ഈ നിയമസഭക്കു കാര്യവിവാദങ്ങളിലുള്ള സാമർത്ഥ്യത്തെ നിലനിർത്തേണ്ട ചുമതലയുടെപേരിലും ഞാൻ ഈ സഭയോടു അഭ്യർത്ഥിക്കുന്നു.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri)*: Sir, I rise to support this motion. Sir, it is an admitted fact that all sides of the House want responsible government, and full responsible government. That has been our annual demand. Apart from that question, the party now in power has a Minister who himself got us to support not full responsible government, but the appointment of one more minister. And therefore when we see that that very member who demanded one more minister from the government and who has been given support from all parts of the house, and when we find that he himself is in the seat of the ministerial portfolio and in power, we would like to see him translated that proposition which he sponsored and got the consent of the House. What is wrong therefore in the motion? The motion did not say full responsible government. The motion only asks for a Council of ministers. Council of ministers may consist of only two ministers. What has therefore the speech of the Hon'ble Mr. Viswambharan to oppose in this and to say that it is an irresponsible way of doing it.? I am only saying that we look to the minister, when he has a chance to urge upon the government his own proposition and if possible, by threatening the government that he would resign, urge upon the government to support the proposition which he himself has brought before the House.

Mr. K. M. Ibrahim *(Cranganur)*: Did you do like that when you were in power?

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri)*: Put me in power and see what would have been done. I would have done worse than the present minister or better than the present minister what I am saying is this. The minister could say pressure has been brought from the opposition and the opposition is taunting me that I am not doing anything to implement my own proposition which I am bound to do in that way we are making out a case for you.

Deputy President: If the motion is carried, the minister cannot be there to threaten the government.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development)*: Should you not give me an opportunity to place the facts before the authorities concerned. The moment it is passed what will happen ? I will go out.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri)*: We are not asking the minister to be removed.

Deputy President: It comes to that.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development)*: It is not a minister that is required, but a council of ministers.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri)*: Supposing this motion is carried, what would happen ? The Rs. 6,000 will have to be omitted from the budget. It may be certified by the Diwan.

Mr. T. K. Nayar *(Minister for Rural Development)*: No, not a pie. Do you mean to say that the minister can continue with a certified demand to receive the salary?

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Trichur-North)*: If the motion is carried, Rs. 6,000 is cut. It is tantamount to the removal of the minister. It is one thing to ask for progressive government and for further developments ; but there is an element of threat in this motion. If you do not do it, we will do certain things. That has not been the practice here. I think on the whole it is a very difficult proposition.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri)*: When my hon'ble friend was sitting on the other side, he thought that even if a cut of Re. 1 salary is made, he will accept it as a censure and resign. I am not in agreement with that proposition. At present there is no such thing.

Mr. P. Govinda Menon *(Mulakunnathukavu)*: We will never make you Minister.

Mr. A. B. Salam *(Mattancheri)*: I don't want to be your Minister. What I am aiming to bring out is my Hon'ble Friend Dr. A. R. Menon and the others are confusing ideas. In a responsible Government and in a parliamentary Government, not like this parliament, in a sovereign parliamentary Government, if one penny of the Minister's salary is cut, the Minister should go out. Here we have a Mony-real Act, an Act which brings autocracy. beaurocracy, diarchy, democratic ideas all mixed together and *avial* is given to us. In such a constitution, these principles will never work. This discussion will enable the Minister to press upon the Government the implementing of the proposition for which he was responsible. Therefore from that aspect we bring this proposition and I would ask the Hon'ble Member not to press this motion to a division, because under the convention that we have already established, there will be no other alternative for the Minister but to follow that contention. That difficulty I appreciate. And I may answer my friend on the left that even if I am there, I will also subject myself to that convention. Therefore, I think it is better for all concerned to withdraw this resolution.

*Dr. A. R. Menon *(Trichur-North)*: The object of the resolution is only to impress upon the minds of the Government that further constitutional advance must be made as early as possible. I have been noticing and experiencing the difficulty and I hope the House won't think that because I am seated on this side of the House, that the position of the Minister is on the whole not a very difficult one indeed. He is between the devil and the deep sea and he has to face the criticisms of this House. He finds himself unable to give effect to the desires and to the wishes of this House owing to various causes and owing to various restrictions imposed upon him. I have always thought that while this reform has done some good and placed us in the forefront of the Indian States with regard to the representative responsible system of Government, it never was an unalloyed blessing, because I have also noticed from the day this reform came and I have been saying even before, I have been noticing that somehow or other the power and the influence of this Council which we used to exercise upon the Government have been reduced to a very great extent. It is inevitable in a diarchy that one part of the House should as far as possible support the Government and only in extreme cases will they join with the other members of the Council. What was the result? The result has been the fear that we used to put into the minds of the Hon'ble friends sitting there, especially the Secretary, has disappeared, because there is always the feeling of security that one part of the House or the other will support him. Thus, while it has done a lot of good, which I do not deny, it indirectly has contributed to the lowering of the influence and also to the check that we used to exercise upon the Government. The only way to get over this difficulty is to gradually change the whole aspect of the Government and gradually introduce full Ministerial Government so that there may always be a vigorous opposition and Government party. Now, as things stand as the Council is constituted and as we consider the principle, it is almost always impossible for a vigorous opposition to be offered in this Council. Out of 56 members, I believe 12 are Government servants and the rest are non-officials. In a house of 56, a solid block of 12 is a dead weight. Unless we remove this permanent barrier and this perpetual weight, there shall not be any vigorous opposition, and unless there is vigorous opposition, it is too much to expect that there will be any efficient Government in the State. Thus I argue that the efficiency of the administration has nothing to do with the ministerial side. I am saying that the efficiency of the administration has been lowered to some extent for want of that perpetual persistent watchfulness on the part of the members of this House. I believe any member who goes through and considers this question deeply will come to the conclusion that there is something in what I have said in this House. Therefore, for the future efficiency of the Government, it is essential that as far as possible, without undue delay, the system known as diarchy should be gradually changed. Of course it is always very difficult to change one system of Government to another. And during the transition period, difficulties do arise. And I am the last person to say that at a time of stress and danger as we are living now is the proper time, the proper occasion to experiment upon it. What I want is that the House agrees with me to convey to the Government the idea that we are very anxious that further progress should be effected. As I have observed Sir, in addressing this House on the occasion of the voted condolence passed on the sad demise of His Highness the late Maharaja, it was almost the intention to expand and broaden the constitutional basis by appointing another minister. I have said that it was an open secret that there was an idea of doing it then. It was then considered in connection with His Highness' birthday some such declaration will be made. Now Sir, at that time if we were advanced so much as to have taken a step to have one Minister, two ministers or even three ministers, are you going to tell me that we have not advanced to take a further step? The only justification that I have said is the existing state of things. But I want the Government to realise our aspirations and our desires that as early as possible further constitutional advance must be made and we want also to show to the Government that in this matter the House I believe is unanimously in agreement. It is only to bring this to the notice of the Government that this cut motion is brought. I think Mr. Moothedan would do well to withdraw the cut motion as I said the carrying out of the motion will I believe result in the immediate resignation of the Minister. I think generally speaking, if this cut motion, whether it be for Re. 1 or more, apart from the pay, he can carry on without pay, the moment the cut is carried, his salary is gone. My friend used to say a one rupee cut, which means 3 pies a day, from the pay would not matter much. It is only an indication of the fact that the House does not want the Minister to continue. That is the convention that I have established. I have no doubt that the present Minister also would follow that convention. For these reasons, it cannot be supported. At the same time, by putting it to vote, and the majority refuses it, it may be interpreted that we are not in favour of further constitutional reforms.

*Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

That makes matters worse. If Mr. Moothedan is anxious and sincere that further progress should be made, the best thing for him is to withdraw the motion. I would certainly advise him and recommend him to do so.

*മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. കെ. നായർ: ദ്വിഭരണസമ്പ്രദായം മൂന്നര കൊല്ലത്തോളംകാലം നടത്തി അതിന്റെ നല്ല വശങ്ങളും ദുഷിച്ചവശങ്ങളും ധാരാളം അനുഭവിച്ചു പരിചയപ്പെട്ട എന്റെ മാന്യ സ്നേഹിതൻ ഡോക്ടർ എ. ആർ. മേനോന്റെ വിശദീകരണത്തിൽ കവിഞ്ഞു് ഇനം ഈ മന്ത്രിസ്ഥാനത്തിൽ ഇരുന്നുകൊണ്ടു് എനിക്കു് ഈ വിഷയത്തിൽ ഒന്നും പറയുവാനില്ല. മന്ത്രിസ്ഥാനത്തിരിക്കുന്ന ആൾക്കു് ഉദ്ബോധനം നൽകുകയെപ്പറ്റിയും എന്നേക്കാൾ എത്രയൊ അധികം പരിചയമുള്ള അദ്ദേഹം വിശദീകരിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു്. എങ്കിലും പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം കൊച്ചിയിൽ സ്ഥാപിച്ചു കിട്ടണം എന്നുള്ള വാദക്കാരിൽ ഞാനും ഒരു പങ്കുകാരനായിരുന്നു. (ഹിയർ, ഹിയർ) അനവധി കൊല്ലക്കാലം ഈ നിയമസഭയിൽ പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം വേണമെന്നുള്ളതു പാസാക്കിയതിനുശേഷം അതിന്റെ ആദ്യത്തെപടിയായ, ഇന്നു നമ്മൾ അനുഭവിച്ചുവരുന്ന ഈ ഡയാക്കി സമ്പ്രദായത്തിൽ ചില വകുപ്പുകൾ ഒരു മന്ത്രിക്കു വിട്ടു തന്നതു് പരിപൂർണ്ണമായി എന്നു വിശ്വസിച്ചു് ഈ നിയമസഭ സമ്മതിച്ചതല്ലെന്നു് ഈ നിയമസഭയിലുള്ള അനുദ്യോഗസ്ഥ സാമാജികന്മാരെല്ലാം വെളിപ്പെടുത്തീട്ടുണ്ടു്. ആ സംഗതി ഗവൺമെണ്ടിനു മനസ്സിലായിക്കഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടുമുണ്ടു്. (ഹിയർ, ഹിയർ) എത്രയോ ആദർശപരമായും എത്രയോ ഗൌരവനിലയിലും പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണം ഉടനെ കിട്ടണമെന്നു് നമ്മൾ ഇവിടെ പാസ്സാക്കീട്ടുണ്ടെങ്കിലും, പ്രായോഗികമായവശങ്ങളിൽ പരിചയം സിദ്ധിക്കുവാനുള്ള ചില വകുപ്പുകൾ വിട്ടുതരണമെന്ന സന്മനസ്സോടുകൂടി ഗവൺമെണ്ടു് ഇറങ്ങി പ്രവൃത്തിച്ച അവസരത്തിൽ തീച്ചയായും അതു സ്വീകരിക്കേണ്ടതു നമ്മുടെ കടമയാണെന്നു ധരിച്ചുകൊണ്ടാണു് ഇതു നമ്മൾ സ്വീകരിച്ചതു്. (ഹിയർ, ഹിയർ) ഇതു് ആദ്യത്തെ ഒരു പടിമാത്രമാണു്, ഇതിന്റെ പരീക്ഷണം സ്വല്പകാലത്തേക്കുനടത്തി ഫലം അറിഞ്ഞതിനുശേഷം കൂടുതൽ കൂടുതൽ വകുപ്പുകൾ നമ്മൾക്കു വിട്ടുതന്നു് നമ്മുടെ പ്രാപ്യസ്ഥാനമായ പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വ ഭരണത്തിൽ എത്തിച്ചേരണമെന്നുള്ള ആശ അന്നും എന്നും നമുക്കെല്ലാവർക്കുമുണ്ടായിരുന്നു, ഇപ്പോഴും ഉണ്ടുതാനും.

ഇതിന്റെ രണ്ടാമത്തെ പടിയായിട്ടാണു് ഈ നിയമസഭയിൽതന്നെ ഒരു മൂന്നു വകുപ്പുകൂടി ഒരു മന്ത്രിക്കു വിട്ടുകൊടുക്കണം എന്നുള്ള ഒരു പ്രമേയം നമ്മൾ പാസാക്കിയതു്. അന്നു് ആ പ്രമേയം പാസാക്കുവാൻതന്നെ വളരെ അഭിപ്രായവ്യത്യാസങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നു. എന്നാൽ അന്നു് അതു് ഒരു മദ്ധ്യസ്ഥ തീർപ്പുപോലെയാണു് അവസാനിച്ചതു്. പരിപൂർണ്ണമായ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തിനല്ലാതെ പടിപടിയായിട്ടുള്ള കയറ്റത്തിനു സമ്മതക്കാരല്ലെന്നുള്ള പക്ഷക്കാർ അനുദ്യോഗസ്ഥ സാമാജികന്മാരുടെയിടയിൽ ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നുവെങ്കിലും ആ പ്രമേയത്തെ എതിർക്കുന്നപക്ഷം നിയമസഭയിൽ ഒരു യോജിച്ച അഭിപ്രായം ഇല്ലെന്ന കാരണത്താൽ ഗവൺമെണ്ടു് അതിനെ സ്വീകരിക്കാതിരുന്നേക്കാമെന്നുകരുതി, നമ്മുടെ പ്രാപ്യസ്ഥാനം പരിപൂർണ്ണ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണമാണെങ്കിലും അതിനെ അനുകൂലിക്കുകയാണു ചെയ്തതു്.

മിസ്റ്റർ എ. ബി. സേലം: ഗവൺമെണ്ടിനു് എതിർപ്പുണ്ടായിരുന്നില്ല.

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. കെ. നായർ; ഗവൺമെണ്ടിനു എതിർക്കുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ലാത്ത പതനത്തിൽ അവർ എത്തിക്കഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നു് വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നവനാണു ഞാൻ. ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തിന്റെ തത്വം ഗവൺമെണ്ടു് സ്വീകരിച്ചുകഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ടു്. പ്രായോഗികവശങ്ങൾ മനസ്സിലാക്കി പടിപടിയായി കയറിപോകുവാൻ നിയമസഭ തയ്യാറാണെന്നു പല അവസരങ്ങളിലും ഇവിടെ വെളിവാക്കീട്ടുള്ള സ്ഥിതിക്കു് തീച്ചയായും നമ്മുടെ ഗവൺമെണ്ടു് ഈ കാര്യത്തിൽ എന്തെങ്കിലും കഴിയുന്നവേഗത്തിൽ ഒരു അനുകൂലമായ തീർപ്പുണ്ടാക്കുമെന്നു ഞാൻ മോഹിക്കുന്നു. മന്ത്രിസ്ഥാനത്തിരുന്നുകൊണ്ടു് എന്തെല്ലാം ചെയ്യുവാൻ സാധിക്കുമെന്നുള്ളതു് എന്നേക്കാൾ എത്രയൊ അധികം പരിചയമുള്ള എന്റെ മാന്യസ്നേഹിതൻ ഡോക്ടർ എ. ആർ. മേനോൻ ഇവിടെ വിശദീകരിച്ചുകഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ടു്.

മിസ്റ്റർ എ. ബി. സേലം: വശീകരിക്കുന്നതു് ഓരോരുത്തരുടെ വശംപോലെയല്ലേ?

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. കെ. നായർ: ഭരണമാറ്റങ്ങൾ വശീകരണംകൊണ്ടോ മന്ത്രവാദംകൊണ്ടോ സാദ്ധ്യമല്ല. അധികാരം വിട്ടുകൊടുക്കുന്നകാര്യം വശീകരണംകൊണ്ടു നടക്കുമെന്നു വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നവനല്ല ഞാൻ. എന്നാലാവുന്നവിധം ഞാൻ അതിനു പരിശ്രമിച്ചുകൊള്ളാമെന്നും ഇപ്പോഴും പരിശ്രമിക്കുന്നുണ്ടെന്നും ഉറപ്പുനൽകുന്നു. (ഹിയർ, ഹിയർ)

*Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ഈ പ്രമേയം പ്രസ്സ്ചെയ്യുന്നപക്ഷം, ശമ്പളംകൂടാതെ ഒരു മന്ത്രി ഇവിടെ ഇരിക്കുമെന്നുകൂടി ഇതിൽ ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നുവെങ്കിൽ, ഈ നിയമസഭയുടെ പ്രതിഷേധം കാണിക്കാനായിട്ടെങ്കിലും ആ ത്യാഗത്തിനുംകൂടി ഞാൻ തയ്യാറാണു്. പക്ഷെ പണം ഇല്ലാതെ ആർക്കും ജീവിക്കുവാൻ സാദ്ധ്യമല്ല. ആ ഒരു ഭാഗം ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തിൽ ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നാൽ ഉത്തരവാദിത്വഭരണത്തിന്റെ വിജയത്തിനായിട്ടു് ഞാൻ അങ്ങിനെ ഒരു ത്യാഗം സഹിക്കുമായിരുന്നു. ഈ പ്രമേയം ഇവിടെ പ്രസ്സ്ചെയ്യുന്നപക്ഷം ഭൂരിപക്ഷം ആളുകൾക്കും അനുകൂലിക്കുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. എന്നാൽ അദ്ദേഹം ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ആക്ഷേപവശങ്ങൾക്കു് ഇവിടെയുണ്ടായിട്ടുള്ള വാദപ്രതിവാദങ്ങൾ ഫലമുണ്ടാക്കുമെന്നാണു് എന്റെ വിശ്വാസം. ഈ വിഷയത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ചുണ്ടായിട്ടുള്ള വാദപ്രതിവാദങ്ങൾക്കുശേഷം നിയമസഭയുടെ അഭിപ്രായമെന്താണെന്നുള്ളതു് ദിവാൻജി അവർകൾക്കും മഹാരാജാവുതിരുമനസ്സിലേക്കും അറിയുവാനുള്ള ഒരു സന്ദർഭം അദ്ദേഹം ഉണ്ടാക്കീട്ടുണ്ടെന്നാണു് എന്റെ വിശ്വാസം. അതുകൊണ്ടു് ഇതിവിടെ പ്രസ്സ്ചെയ്യേണ്ട ആവശ്യമുണ്ടെന്നതോന്നുന്നില്ല. ഈ നിയമസഭയുടെ അഭിപ്രായപ്രകാരം ഈ സംഗതിക്കുവേണ്ടി എന്നാലാവുന്നത്ര പരിശ്രമിച്ചുകൊള്ളാമെന്നു് ഞാൻ ഒന്നുകൂടി ഇവിടെ പറഞ്ഞുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi)*: If the motion is carried, there are two courses. The Hon'ble Minister may resign or may not resign. He can carry on, because in the budget, in addition to the Rs. 6,000, there is the allowance. All these are in tact and the amount is there. There is no intention that the Minister should resign.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur)*: The motion opposes the system of one Minister. It is not a question of salary.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi)*: So long as the Cochin Payment of Salaries and Allowances Act is there, he can draw his salary and allowance, by debit to "38 Miscellaneous". What is the objection?

Point of Order

Mr. M. L. Joseph *(Latin-Christians-Cranganur)*: On a point of order. It is not a question of rupees annas pies. It is a question of principle. This question establishes a healthy convention. We have already established a convention whereby if the Minister's salary is cut by a majority that is tantamount to a no-confidence motion. This is a question where the whole salary is to be omitted. Naturally there won't be any Minister for that matter who will be so retrograde in his views as to sit, as Mr. Moothedan says, and continue as Minister. I would say it would be doing a positive harm to the constitution.

Deputy President: In this case, the Minister will have to resign.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi)*: This is not a no-confidence motion. Minister should resign only if there is a no-confidence motion.

Deputy President: If it is not a censure motion, it is a direction for the Minister to resign, to show his protest to the Government. Therefore he will have to resign.

Mr. T. P. Poulose *(Kanayannur)*: Passing of this cut motion to omit the whole of the Minister's salary will be a direction that nobody should take up the Ministry as long as His Highness the Maharaja refuses to grant a council of Ministers.

Mr. K. M. Ibrahim *(Cranganur)*: The point is this. If a full responsible Government, full-fledged council of Ministers, is not granted, the Hon'ble Member would prefer the old bureaucracy even to the present one Minister. So the vote of the house will come to that.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi)*: According to law, the Minister should resign only when a no-confidence motion is passed.

Deputy President: Because the Minister is responsible to the legislature, he has to obey the direction of the members.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Trichur-North)*: Even if it involves one rupee cut, he has to resign. How is it that when the whole amount is removed, he will not resign? He is expected to tender his resignation. We have established a convention. I cannot understand the statement that he need not resign when the whole amount is omitted.

He is bound to take it as a censure. It is only a direction to the Minister to resign and show his protest to the Government. The council calls upon him to resign. It is a censure of the other half.

Deputy President: In any case, the Minister has to resign.

Mr. T. S. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Chittur-Tattamangalam)*: If the Chair allows me, I would like to offer one suggestion. There is a resolution standing in the name of Mr. Ikkanda Warrier,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

viz., Resolution No. 45 which demands that more responsible Government should be given. There have been precedents in this House when similar subjects clothed in different languages were put to the vote of the House together.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* I wanted to bring to the notice of the Government our demand in a most effective way. The Government are very prosaic. They do not want to do anything. The Ministerialist Party wants responsible Government; but they are not bold enough to sacrifice anything. Mr. Viswambharan says this is an irresponsible resolution. He charges me with irresponsibility. Is it not my duty to demand responsible Government? This form I took because it is more effective and more impressive. Why should my friend be so very afraid. He can continue to be national organiser. He need not be afraid of that. Because several hon'ble members are opposed to it, I don't press it. I withdraw.

Cut Motion No. 4 withdrawn with the leave of the House.

CUT MOTION No. 5

Relief of distress of the needy etc., by legislation

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* I rise to move *"To reduce the allotment of Rs. 73,125 for Huzur Secretariat establishment by Re. 1"*. The object of my motion is *"to urge on the Government to take steps urgently to relieve the distress of the needy, aged, widows and orphans of the people of the State by legislation."*

Sir, even in the midst of this great war, with enormus collosal expenditure in Great Britain for the defence of the cause throughout all the fronts in the world, huge sums of money and more money are being allotted for the purpose of providing food and clothes for all the people in her land. This proposition here is necessary because there is always a number of people roaming about the streets, begging from door to door, and in the streets to all the passers-by for food. They do not even ask for cloth, although they are more than semi-naked. This pitiable sight does not exist in our minds because we are so accustomed to see that sight that we have become absolutely callous to the great distress and dirt and squalor exhibited to our eyes. By seeing it always, we have lost the sense of appreciating the enormity of it. All people want to take pride in giving food to the poor. Poor feeding is an item in great festivities everywhere in India. What is poor feeding after all? One meal of some little rice and vegetable and nothing more for days together. This is the poor feeding that we admire. That is not correct. I was so immensely pleased to read that part of the speech of the Diwan from the Chair saying that the test of a good administration will be how it gives food and cloth to the various poor people in the land, and I was still more gratified when he said *"I shall do everything possible to give the wherewithals to fill their stomach and to cover their bodies."* This is a noble aspiration of the head of our administration. He has said that, not only on the floor of this House, but from the beach at Andikadavu where my Hon'ble Friend Mr. Peter took him for the purpose of putting some groynes to prevent the country from erosion. There has been a great cry to give employment to a large number of people. Already 7 or 8 thousand have gone out; 10 thousand people are absorbed in the island and there is a shortage of labour facing the country. Therefore a large number of people submerged in poverty and squalor are now able to get something. Therefore there remains only a very small number amidst the aged the widows and the orphans of the State who will have to be provided for, at government expense. I would respectfully ask the Hon'ble Secretary to bear this in mind and take early steps to move the Government of His Highness, whom we know to be full of feelings for his subjects. Initiate legislation for the purpose of providing a fund from which these three classes can be made to have the wherewithal of life, little food and little cloth—two *mundoos* a year, is not a great matter at all. One *nazhi* of food costing one anna is not a very great thing and the number of people have been ascertained. It is only a small number. I will give you money also. Then you will have no difficulty. There is an apprehension that if the house accepts this responsibility how on earth will we find the money wherefrom this desideratum can be met. Sir, I have a proposition before me which you can consider in the legislature. If every man that gets pay contribute a quarter of an anna towards the *Peoples Welfare Fund* and leave it in the treasury, that fund will continously grow and we will have ample money in the treasury for this purpose, because it will be enormously growing daily. Quarter of an anna per rupee from the salary of all officers and others in salaries private employment and wage earners is enough. In ancient times 1/10 of the income was given away for the purpose of feeding the poor. Quarter of an anna is not too much. What is one quarter of an anna for Rs. 800. 800 quarter anna, what will it come to?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly